



Improved Oscillator Phase Locking Using a Modulated Electron Beam in a Gyrotron

A. H. MCCURDY, C. M. ARMSTRONG, W. M. BOLLEN,
R. K. PARKER, AND V. L. GRANATSTEIN

*Microwave and Millimeter Wave Tube Technology Branch
Electronics Technology Division*

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				
1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE				
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) NRL Report 9027			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Naval Research Laboratory		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) 6840		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Washington, DC 20375-5000			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION ONR/ONT		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Arlington, VA 22217			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.
			TASK NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. DN480-973
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Improved Oscillator Phase Locking Using a Modulated Electron Beam in a Gyrotron				
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) McCurdy, ¹ A.H., Armstrong, C.M., Bollen, ² W.M., Parker, R.K., and Granatstein, ³ V.L.				
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Interim		13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1986 December 4
15. PAGE COUNT 12				
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION (See page ii)				
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP		
			Gyroklystron Phase locked oscillator	
			Gyrotron Primed oscillator	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)				
<p>A new method of microwave oscillator phase locking exploiting the extended nature of the gyrokystron configuration is accomplished by modulating the electron beam before it reaches the cavity oscillator. The amount of power required to phase-lock a gyrotron is decreased by more than an order of magnitude from that predicted by Adler's theory. In addition, oscillator priming is observed at drive powers below all other systems tested to date. These new methods provide the coherence required of RF sources for linear accelerators and may enhance gyrotron performance for fusion heating.</p>				
20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Alan H. McCurdy			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 767-3936	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL 6842

DD FORM 1473, 84 MAR

83 APR edition may be used until exhausted.
All other editions are obsolete

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

★U.S. Government Printing Office: 1985-507-047

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

1. Also at Section of Applied Physics, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520
2. Mission Research Corporation, Alex., VA 22312
3. University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
EXPERIMENTAL APPARATUS	1
Phase Locking	2
Priming	4
CONCLUSION	6
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	6
REFERENCES	6

IMPROVED OSCILLATOR PHASE LOCKING USING A MODULATED ELECTRON BEAM IN A GYROTRON

INTRODUCTION

A continuing need exists for efficient, high-power sources of coherent radiation in the microwave and millimeter wavelength range. The next generation of linear colliders may use microwave sources with a higher rf frequency, (10 to 30 GHz), and a higher peak power, (~ 100 MW), than previous designs to reduce the overall accelerator length [1]. Fusion plasma heating, using electron cyclotron resonance absorption, requires even higher frequencies (> 100 GHz) at continuous wave (CW) powers in the megawatt range [2]. Gyro-devices employing the electron cyclotron resonance maser instability (ECRM) are particularly attractive as sources in these frequency ranges because they have the potential of providing high average power density and good electronic efficiency.

Gyrotron oscillators, [3,4] using a magnetron injection gun and a resonant cavity, are the furthest advanced of the ECRM devices. Over 60% efficiency in the 100 kW output power range with frequencies below 40 GHz [5,6] and 36% efficiency with 175 kW at 140 GHz [7] have been demonstrated in short pulse gyrotrons. CW performance has been pushed to 100 kW at 140 GHz [8]. For applications where the requirement on phase coherence is strict, such as is the case with high-energy linear accelerators, an amplifier such as the gyroklystron [4,9,10] would be appropriate. Gyroamplifiers, however, have not yet demonstrated the high efficiencies and power output of the oscillators; hence, a method of obtaining phase control over the oscillator is of interest.

For the effort described in this report, phase control is achieved by two methods; phase locking and priming. Phase locking is the synchronization in both frequency and phase of a free oscillation by an external signal. Priming is the initiation in phase of a pulsed free oscillation by application of an external signal during the build-up of oscillation. Unlike previous experiments, where phase control was achieved by direct injection of the drive signal into the oscillating cavity, our approach is to phase the oscillator by premodulating the electron beam [11].

EXPERIMENTAL APPARATUS

These experiments are carried out with a 4.5 GHz, three-cavity gyroklystron configuration with the output cavity operating as a free oscillator (Fig. 1). A preliminary observation of phase locking had been made with this arrangement [12]. A study of single cavity gyrotron oscillator response to an external drive shows that there are three qualitatively different regimes of behavior. At low beam currents, the device acts as an amplifier. Above the start oscillation current, there is a *soft excitation* regime where free oscillation takes place in the cavity. For beam currents in a confined region between the other two the oscillator exhibits *hard excitation*, an autonomous oscillation initiated by the external drive signal. The experiments reported here are all carried out with the output cavity operating in the regime of soft excitation (free oscillation).

The gyroklystron configuration consists of three TE_{101} rectangular cavities whose fields interact with the right-hand, circularly polarized beam cyclotron wave at the fundamental electron cyclotron




Fig. 1 — Three-cavity gyrokylystron configuration. The first two cavities are 6.06 cm in length, and the third is 7.4 cm. The connecting drift spaces are 10.1 cm long.

frequency. The cavities are separated by drift sections which are cutoff to the generated RF radiation. These drift sections attenuate intercavity power transfer by a factor of 1,000. The electron beam parameters are 6.2 A at 28.5 KeV with a perpendicular-to-parallel velocity ratio of about 1.0. A 60 Hz pulse repetition rate is used with a pulse width of 4 μ s. The drive signal is applied to cavity 1 to begin electron beam modulation by means of electron cyclotron resonance absorption. The beam is further modulated by ballistic bunching in the drift regions and interaction in cavity 2. The modulated beam then phases the oscillation in the last cavity. Power is extracted via a waveguide from the side wall of this cavity. The last cavity is made unstable by mechanically tuning the cavity resonance close to the Doppler-shifted, relativistic, electron cyclotron frequency. The magnetic field is varied along the axis of the device so that the first cavity absorbs radiation at the drive frequency. Cavity 2 is identical to cavity 1 in both construction and mechanical tuning.

Phase Locking

Phase locking is a feature of self-excited, hence nonlinear, oscillators that was first quantitatively studied by use of electron tube circuits [13]. R. Adler related the oscillator power to drive power ratio and the fractional frequency difference between the drive signal and oscillator in a simple way [14]. This relationship was found to be generally applicable to a broad class of oscillators including microwave cavity oscillators [15] and lasers [16]. In a microwave system, Adler's equation is written [17]

$$Q_e (f_d - f_o) (P_o/P_d)^{1/2}/f_o < 1, \quad (1)$$

where the subscripts d and o refer to the drive signal and oscillator respectively, f is frequency, P is power and Q_e is the external Q of the oscillating cavity. For a given oscillator, this equation describes the frequency band over which phase locking can occur at a given drive power. In this experiment $f_o \cong 4.45$ GHz and $P_o \cong 1$ to 2 kW.

By using the three-cavity gyrokylystron configuration, locking can be obtained at drive power levels more than an order of magnitude below that predicted by Eq. (1). Phase locking is observed experimentally by mixing the drive signal with a fraction of the output and displaying the resulting sinusoidal beat signal on an oscilloscope. The frequency of the beat signal corresponds to the frequency difference between the drive and the oscillation in cavity 3. The beat signal becomes nonsinusoidal and then vanishes as the oscillator makes the transition to the locked state. Locking is confirmed with frequency counters, a spectrum analyzer, a phase discriminator, and crystal diode measurements of intrapulse output power variation.

Figure 2(a) shows the phase locking bandwidth as a function of drive power as calculated from Eq. (1) and measured experimentally for a single cavity gyrottron oscillator (cavity 1). It is found that the phase-locking bandwidth for direct injection of RF into the cavity oscillator follows Adler's theory





Fig. 2 — Phase locking bandwidths for (a) direct injection of cavity 1 with $Q_e = 1100$ and (b) three cavity configuration with $Q_e = 375$ in cavity 3. Note that the locking bandwidth exceeds the theoretical prediction (solid curves), in the multicavity case.

as long as $P_d / P_o \ll 1$. This result is consistent with a previous experiment [18]. The interesting new result, shown in Fig. 2(b), is that phase locking by electron beam modulation in the three-cavity arrangement requires considerably less drive power than predicted by Adler's theory. The difference in power level between the experimental points and the theoretical curve is more than an order of magnitude. This can be understood, in part, as an intensification of beam modulation between the input and output cavities due to the same gain mechanism that operates in the gyrokystron amplifier. Thus the drive power experiences a significant fraction of the gain that a two-cavity gyrokystron amplifier would provide (\sim a factor of 100).

The following are additional advantages of phase locking by means of electron beam modulation:

- a natural separation exists between the driving components and cavity oscillator,
- the drive signal is coupled more efficiently to the electron beam, and
- fluctuations in the gyrotron oscillator amplitude and frequency are reduced.

A major problem encountered in direct injection locking is that of obtaining the high-power circulator, or equivalent reciprocal device, to protect the driver from being phase locked by the oscillator. Since there is a high degree of isolation between the cavities in our configuration, little oscillator power feeds back into the drive circuit. Along with driver protection, this separation between elements allows more efficient coupling of the drive signal onto the beam. The magnetic field or resonant frequency of the input cavity can now be turned for optimum absorption of drive power without degrading the performance of the oscillator.

Significant noise reduction is also noted in the phase locked gyrotron oscillator. The pulse-to-pulse frequency jitter of the oscillation (Fig. 3(a)), is reduced from 18 kHz to a level approaching the 3 kHz driver noise. A frequency discriminator using a mixer-delay line combination is used to obtain these results. In addition the pulse-to-pulse jitter in output power is reduced from 4.3 to 0.3% in the center of the locking band. Figure 3(b) shows this power level fluctuation as a function of frequency difference between the drive and the oscillator. The measurement is made by taking the standard deviation of the voltage output of a crystal diode over 100 pulses. From Fig. 3 it can be seen that both the frequency and amplitude noise become much larger than the free-running values near the edges of the locking frequency band. This observation is consistent with previous phase locked oscillator experiments and theory [15]. The interline noise (noise between sidebands in the output spectrum) of the gyrotron is considerably reduced by phase locking. This reduction is due to a large decrease in starting time jitter of the RF pulse, elimination of frequency variation within the pulse (due to voltage droop across the electron gun), and reduction of pulse-to-pulse frequency excursions. The pulse-to-pulse phase jitter in the locked state is 1.5° in the three-cavity experiment.

Priming

Priming is investigated as another method of phase control. Since the priming effect does not control the oscillator frequency, another stabilizing system must be used to compensate for beam fluctuations during the pulse and the poor frequency selectivity of the low Q output cavity. This stabilization can be achieved by a phase locked feedback loop [19]. Pulse-to-pulse rms phase jitter of less than 2° has been observed on primed magnetrons at drive powers two orders of magnitude lower than the oscillator power [20]. However, we observe similar control in priming our three cavity device at drive power levels seven orders of magnitude below the output power (Fig. 4). This increase in priming efficiency can be attributed to both the linear gain that the beam modulation experiences during RF oscillation build-up (\sim power gain of a factor of one thousand in the three cavity gyrotron amplifier), and the increased coupling of the drive signal to the beam which can be achieved by the drive cavity-oscillator separation. From Fig. 4, it is clear that the degree of phase control increases as the drive power is increased or as the drive frequency approaches that of the gyrotron free oscillation. Notice that the frequency band over which significant control is exerted is an order of magnitude larger than in the phase locked system. The priming measurement is made by mixing the CW drive and pulsed gyrotron oscillator output in phase quadrature and displaying the resultant beat signal on an oscilloscope synchronized to the gyrotron. Pulse-to-pulse variations are then measured from movement of the zero crossings at the beginning of the pulse on the oscilloscope trace. Using a primed gyrotron of this type greatly relaxes the drive power requirements in a phased system.




Fig. 3 — Noise reduction due to phase locking as drive frequency is varied across the locking band. (a) Amplitude noise, ($P_d/P_o = 9.6 \times 10^{-4}$, locking limits ± 6 MHz) and (b) frequency noise, ($P_d/P_o = 6.5 \times 10^{-4}$, locking limits ± 9 MHz), both decrease in the locked region. Also shown is the noise from the free running gyrotron oscillator (dash), and driver (dot).




Fig. 4 — Reduction in start-up phase noise due to priming the pulsed cavity 3 gyrotron oscillator as a function of input drive power and frequency difference between oscillator and driver

CONCLUSION

A new method of phase-locking gyrotrons by premodulating the electron beam produces results that far surpass those of any other locked oscillator system. The power required to lock the oscillator is more than an order of magnitude below that predicted by Adler's theory. In addition, phase control of the gyrotron is obtained by priming at unprecedented low drive power levels. This work is expected to have an impact on gyrotron oscillator development and application since phase and frequency control can be obtained with small drive signals. Perhaps the most important application of these techniques will be the reduction of mode competition and the increase of oscillation efficiency in the overmoded gyrotron oscillator. This differs from mode selection by means of a complex cavity [21] in that here the input cavity is below the start oscillation threshold and oscillation control is exerted externally. These issues will be addressed in a later work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank A.K. Ganguly and S.Y. Park for helpful discussion and J. McAdoo for work on the phase diagnostic. The efforts of S. Swiadek and F. Wood in the design and assembly of the experimental apparatus are also acknowledged. This work was supported by the Office of Naval Research and the Office of Naval Technology.

REFERENCES

1. B. Richter, *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **NS-32**, 3828 (1985).
2. R.M. Gilgenbach et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**, 647 (1980); V.V. Alikaev et al., *JETP Lett.* **35**, 140 (1982).
3. A.V. Gaponov, M.I. Petelin, and V.K. Yulpatov, *Radiophys. Quant. Electron.* **10**, 794 (1967).
4. R.S. Symons and H.R. Jory, in *Advances in Electronic and Electron Physics*, **55**, 1, L. Marton and C. Marton eds. (Academic, New York, 1981).
5. Y. Carmel et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50**, 112 (1983).
6. M.E. Read, K.R. Chu, and A.J. Dudas, *IEEE Trans. Microwave Theory Tech.* **MTT-30**, 42 (1982).
7. K.E. Kreischer et al., *Int. J. Electron.* **57**, 835 (1984).
8. K. Felch et al., in *Conference Digest of the Eleventh International Conference on Infrared and Millimeter Waves*, Pisa, Italy, 1986, to be published.
9. B. Arfin and A.K. Ganguly, *Int. J. Electron.* **53**, 709 (1982).
10. A.K. Ganguly, A.W. Fliflet, and A.H. McCurdy, *IEEE Trans. Plasma Sci.* **PS-13**, 409 (1985).
11. V.S. Ergakov and M.A. Moiseev, *Radiophys. Quantum Electron.* **18**, 89 (1975).
12. W.M. Bollen et al., *IEEE Trans. Plasma Sci.* **PS-13**, 417 (1985).
13. B. van der Pol, *Philos. Mag.* **III**, 65 (1927).
14. R. Adler, *Proc. IRE* **34**, 351 (1946).
15. An overview is given in K. Kurokawa, *Proc. IEEE* **61**, 1386 (1973).

16. R. Lang, M.O. Scully, and W.E. Lamb, Jr., *Phys. Rev.* **A7**, 1788 (1973).
17. J.C. Slater, *Microwave Electronics* (Van Nostrand, New York, 1950), p. 205.
18. M.E. Read, R. Seeley, and W.M. Manheimer, *IEEE Trans. Plasma Sci.* **PS-13**, 398 (1985).
19. D.M. Guillory and R.W. McMillan, in *Conference Digest of the Tenth International Conference on Infrared and Millimeter Waves*, Lake Buena Vista, Florida, 1985, p. 48.
20. B. Vyse and H. Levinson, *IEEE Trans. Microwave Theory Tech.* **MTT-29**, 739 (1981); J.K. Parker, private communication.
21. A.V. Gaponov et al., *Int. J. Electron.* **51**, 277 (1981).